DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 095 608 EA 005 879

AUTHOR	Templeton, Ian
TITLE	Differentiated Staffing. NAESP School Leadership Digest Series, No. 6. ERIC/CEM Research Analysis Series, No. 8.
INSTITUTION	National Association of Elementary School Principals, Washington, D.C.; Oregon Univ., Eugene. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	74
CONTRACT	OEC-0-8-080353-3514
NOTE	31p.; A related document is EA 005 878
AVAILABLE FROM	National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1801 N. Moore Street, Arlington, Virginia 22209 ($24.00 plus postage. Available only as part of series of 13 reports)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Role; Bibliographies; Cost Effectiveness; Decision Making; *Differentiated Staffs; *Educational Change; Educational Finance; Educational Innovation; *Educational Programs; Instructional Staff; Models; Organizational Change; Paraprofessional School Personnel; *Staff Utilization; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Role; Teacher Salaries

ABSTRACT

This report gives a brief history of a differentiated staffing (DS) and outlines the major differences between horizontal and vertical differentiation. The Temple City model provides an example of vertical differentiation, while the Top of the World Elementary School plan is given as a model of horizontal differentiation. Obstacles to DS implementation, arising both from the objections of groups of people and from the nature of organizational change, are outlined. The various claims about the cost of DS programs are examined, and the report observes that a DS program could cost about the same as, or a little more than, a conventional program once it is implemented. The report contends also that the shared decisionmaking characteristic of DS programs could strengthen, rather than weaken, the principal's role in a school. A 53-item bibliography is included. (Author)

ED 095608

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Differentiated Staffing

school leadership digest

Ian Templeton

EA 005 879

Prepared by
ERIC Clearinghouse on
Educational Management

Published by
National Association of
Elementary School Principals

Library of Congress Catalog Number: 74-80570
NAESP School Leadership Digest Series, Number Six
ERIC/CEM Accession Number: EA 005 879
ERIC/CEM Research Analysis Series, Number Eight

Printed in the United States of America, 1974
National Association of Elementary School Principals
1801 North Moore Street
Arlington, Virginia 22209

The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the National Association of Elementary School Principals for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the National Association of Elementary School Principals or the National Institute of Education.

CONTENTS

Foreword	v
Introduction	1
A Brief History	1
Horizontal and Vertical Differentiation	2
Two Models with Two Different Assumptions	5
Temple City: A Vertical Model	5
Top of the World Elementary School: A Horizontal Model	7
Keeping the Cost Down	11
Obstacles to Implementation	14
The Principal's Role	17
Conclusion	20
Bibliography	21

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) is a national information system operated by the National Institute of Education. ERIC serves the educational community by disseminating educational research results and other resource information that can be used in developing more effective educational programs.

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, one of several clearinghouses in the system, was established at the University of Oregon in 1966. The Clearinghouse and its companion units process research reports and journal articles for announcement in ERIC's index and abstract bulletins.

Research reports are announced in *Resources in Education (RIE)*, available in many libraries and by subscription for $38 a year from the United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Most of the documents listed in *RIE* can be purchased through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, operated by Computer Microfilm International Corporation.

Journal articles are announced in *Current Index to Journals in Education. CIJE* is also available in many libraries and can be ordered for $44 a year from Macmillan Information, 866 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10022. Annual and semiannual cumulations can be ordered separately.

Besides processing documents and journal articles, the Clearinghouse has another major function—information analysis and synthesis. The Clearinghouse prepares bibliographies, literature reviews, state-of-the-knowledge papers, and other interpretive research studies on topics in its educational area.

FOREWORD

With the *School Leadership Digest* series, the National Association of Elementary School Principals adds another project to its continuing program of publications designed to offer school leaders essential information on a wide range of critical concerns in education.

The *School Leadership Digest* is a series of monthly reports on top priority issues in education. At a time when decisions in education must be made on the basis of increasingly complex information, the *Digest* provides school administrators with concise, readable analyses of the most important trends in schools today, as well as points up the practical implications of major research findings.

By special cooperative arrangement, the series draws on the extensive research facilities and expertise of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. The titles in the series were planned and developed cooperatively by both organizations. Utilizing the resources of the ERIC network, the Clearinghouse is responsible for researching the topics and preparing the copy for publication by NAESP.

The author of this report, Ian Templeton, is employed by the Clearinghouse as an associate editor for publications.

Paul L. Houts
Director of Publications
NAESP

Stuart C. Smith
Assistant Director and Editor
ERIC/CEM

INTRODUCTION

> Ironically, in certain sincere attempts to differentiate staff, the implementation has been so partial, fragmentary, isolated or restricted that more educational quality has been lost than gained. Trying to differentiate the assignment and remuneration of school staff members without systematic concurrent changes in scheduling and curriculum on a wide scale is an exercise in frustration. . . . Give a woodchopper an assistant to help him keep his axes sharp, and he remains a woodchopper rather than a surgeon—which is fine so long as he is working on trees and not children.
>
> Finally, perhaps the time has come for a legitimate redefinition of what we are about in proposing and developing differentiated staffing patterns—if not an expansion of the original notions about some alternative to traditional staffing, at least a regrouping of ideas in light of the experiences of the last few years in trying to implement changes in staffing practice.
>
> *Allen and Kline*

The present is indeed a good time to reassess the meaning of differentiated staffing (DS). If the decline in federal support and the decrease in the volume of writing on DS are any indication, the initial fervor for and against DS seems to be diminishing. Perhaps this cooler atmosphere will allow for less partisan examinations of the concept.

There is a chance, of course, that DS was simply an idea that flourished in the late 1960s never to be heard of again, but this is unlikely. Too many schools claim success with DS plans and DS is too closely related to many other innovations that are becoming more, rather than less, widely adopted for DS to be ignored.

A Brief History

Differentiated staffing is a child of the 1950s and 1960s although some writers have noted far earlier antecedents. A 1973 Department of Health, Education, and Welfare report,

for instance, cites the Bell-Lancaster monitorial program instituted in 1791 as a historical precedent. Other writers look closer to the present for antecedents.

Hyer and McClure see the oldest model of DS in the initial separation of roles among teacher, principal, and superintendent with further differentiation occurring with the introduction of teaching specialists, subject matter departments, supervisors, and teaching assistants. Yet, as they note, these "roles were additive to the classroom teacher and did not result, to any degree, in differentiation of roles among teachers."

A more complete differentiation arrived with team teaching in the mid-1950s. A prime mover in the development of team teaching was the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), which sponsored a series of staff utilization studies under the direction of J. Lloyd Trump. The studies eventually produced what came to be known as the Trump plan. The plan called for team teaching, large- and small-group instruction, independent study, and flexible scheduling.

Hyer and McClure consider that the NASSP program on the secondary level and team teaching on the elementary level "prepared the way for the more radical experimentation in staff utilization involving hierarchical or vertical differentiation of teaching staffs and a departure from the single salary schedule."

Horizontal and Vertical Differentiation

The Trump plan is generally regarded as the first model for horizontal differentiation of staffs. Horizontal differentiation assumes that teachers perform different kinds of tasks and that these tasks are equal in importance and responsibility. As Keefe explains it:

> The Trump design envisions a departmental or inter-disciplinary teaching team which builds on the varying talents and individual differences that exist among teachers. The plan suggests a team teaching approach with differentiated functions among teachers in somewhat the way the school hopes to provide for individual differences among the pupils. This concept, however,

> does not imply a hierarchy of teachers; it proposes a team of peers working together, utilizing their different talents for the common good of the students. It means that the school deliberately employs a staff with divergent training, competencies and interests. It means that the school capitalizes on the differences among teachers rather than attempts to push them into traditional molds.

The second model—vertical or hierarchical differentiation—is usually attributed to Dwight Allen. This model assumes that teachers perform different tasks and that these tasks are not equal in importance and responsibility. These plans also acknowledge that teachers have different talents and interests. They differ from horizontal plans in their emphasis on the degrees of responsibility associated with the differentiated teaching roles. This forms the basis of the career ladder; a new or inexperienced teacher can begin with a less responsible role and work up the career ladder to a more responsible and, possibly, more remunerative position in the team.

The basic assumption behind most DS plans—horizontal and vertical—is that a change in the condition of the teacher will produce a change in the learner. A great deal of the interest in DS has stemmed from the realization that the teacher is asked to perform too many different and varied roles for one person to accomplish adequately. The increasing need for specialized knowledge about subjects, techniques, and equipment combined with the nonprofessional duties that have long been the province of teachers (typing, grading, monitoring halls, and so forth) are placing too many strains on the self-contained teacher in a self-contained classroom.

Making the teacher's position more manageable is now only one hope associated with DS. The range of hopes pinned on DS can be seen in a list taken from a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare report. The report notes that advocates of DS believe it will accomplish the following:

1. Individualize instruction for children by bringing to the school setting new people (or retrained persons) who can diagnose learning difficulties and prescribe solutions.
2. Make the job of each person more rewarding, psychologically as well as financially, by establishing increased specialization

of responsibilities. Financial rewards would be consistent with performance, not necessarily with longevity, as is the case with the single-salary schedule.

3. Avoid the evils of merit pay as conceived by the teachers' associations.
4. Establish accountability and responsibility for teaching and learning.
5. Create conditions which force teacher education institutions to modify their programs, thereby becoming more relevant to the needs of our time.
6. Change the organizational structure of the schools, distributing the power for decision-making among those responsible for the execution of decisions, particularly classroom teachers.
7. Offer a career pattern for teachers who wish to remain in the classroom rather than to be promoted away from children into administration.
8. Provide a career opportunity program for the poor through well-delineated career ladder and lattice arrangements. This may be one way to bring home and school closer together for common causes.
9. Force needed review in teacher certification procedures and requirements.
10. Convince the public of the need for increased fiscal support of education and at the same time redeploy existing resources for more efficient use of current financing.

Although it is not exhaustive, this list is representative and touches on the most commonly stressed goals of DS—individualizing instruction, establishing a career ladder for teachers, and decentralizing school decision-making.

Obviously, DS implies far more than the redeployment of a few teachers and the hiring of some paraprofessionals. Jacobson and others have stressed that DS affects all personnel associated with a school, as well as the entire curriculum, community relations, equipment and materials, facilities, and decision-making. For DS to have its full effect it must include team teaching, paraprofessionals, flexible scheduling, and revisions in the curriculum at the very least. If a school opts for DS, it is choosing a program, a process, that implies almost complete renovation of the way the school operates.

TWO MODELS WITH TWO DIFFERENT ASSUMPTIONS

Differentiated staffing programs are subject to a great deal of variety in their design and emphasis. For instance, some programs stress curricular changes, some the change in decision-making patterns. So much variety is possible that even the basic distinction between horizontal and vertical differentiation means little unless the details of specific programs are given. In this section, two models are presented. They are representative of vertical and horizontal plans, but they also reflect areas of emphasis that are unique to the district or school in which they have been implemented.

Temple City: A Vertical Model

The Temple City, California, school district is generally held to have been the first to implement a DS plan. If not the first plan, the Temple City model is certainly the most widely publicized. It is so well known that Barbee as well as Allen and Kline have expressed some concern that many educators have taken the Temple City plan to be *the* DS plan. Allen and Kline note that "few specific applications of any general concept have so quickly tended to become a new and limited orthodoxy as that single model has done."

Because of the impact of the Temple City model, it is essential that people interested in DS be familiar with it. The feature of the plan that gets the most attention is its four-level hierarchy of teachers. The chart at the top of page 6 summarizes the professional and nonprofessional positions in the plan.

Rand has summarized the responsibilities of the professional positions.

> The Associate Teacher is regarded as a novice to the profession. The teaching responsibilities of this person would be

TEMPLE CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
A MODEL OF DIFFERENTIATED STAFFING

			NONTENURE
		NONTENURE	Master Teacher Doctorate or Equivalent
	TENURE	Senior Teacher M.S. or Equivalent	
TENURE	Staff Teacher B.A. Degree and Calif. Credential		
Associate Teacher A.B. or Intern			
100% Teaching	100% Teaching Responsibilities	3/5's Staff Teaching Responsibilities	2/5's Staff Teaching Responsibilities
$6,500-9,000	10 Months $7,500-11,000	10-11 Months $14,500-17,500	12 Months $15,646-25,000
Academic Assistants A.A. Degree or Equivalent $6,000-7,500			
Educational Technicians $4,000-7,500			
Clerks $5,000-7,500			

Source: Rand (1972)

lighter and less demanding than those of the Staff Teacher. The Staff Teacher would carry a full teaching load with the exception of being relieved of most of the nonprofessional tasks, such as yard duty, grading papers, hall supervision. The Staff Teacher would be an experienced, probably tenured teacher, although it would be possible to earn tenure as an Associate Teacher. The Senior Teacher represents the first level above the Staff Teacher and would be the expert in a subject, discipline or skill area. The Master Teacher would be a scholar-research specialist, someone with the technical expertise to apply relevant research to classroom practice. All teachers function as classroom teachers, though not for the entire school day. It is doubtful whether any of the teachers in the hierarchy will be with children all day, since the school would operate on flexible scheduling. Flexible scheduling permits variations in group size, and amounts of teacher time commensurate with diagnosed pupil needs. It also permits teachers to work together during the school day on professional and instructional tasks.

Teachers were prominent on the Steering Committee that designed the program, and they continue to play a major role in the decision-making process. The major decisions in each school are made by the Academic Senate which is composed of the principal and senior teachers, who have the same authority as the principal. Teachers are also involved in curriculum, hiring, and evaluation decisions.

The model, as it has been described so far, was more readily accepted in the secondary schools where established divisions by subject matter made it easier to develop the subject-oriented hierarchy. The program met initial resistance at the elementary level. Rand and English as well as Cooper report that the subject emphasis made the elementary teachers feel that it would not be possible for them to become senior teachers because they had less preparation in a specific field than their colleagues at the secondary level. An elementary principal resolved the conflict by proposing that the role of the senior teacher be expanded at the elementary level. The Goodson plan called for the retention of the senior teacher as a subject matter specialist for all levels, but it included a senior teacher of instruction and a senior teacher of technology to work with the elementary (K-6) teachers

The willingness of the Steering Committee and the elementary faculties to redefine the original model to suit their needs affirms the point that DS should be a process of change, not a definitive model.

Top of the World Elementary School: A Horizontal Model

The horizontally differentiated program at Top of the World Elementary School in Laguna Beach, California, provides marked contrast to the program in the Temple City schools. The contrast is great even though the two programs appear to differ from a conventional program in the same ways: both have team teaching, flexible scheduling, differentiated teacher roles, and changed decision-making patterns. Both also assert that the teacher plays the key role in the

educational process.

The source of the differences between the two models is in the assumptions used in their construction. Rand and English explain the assumption behind the Temple City program.

> The Temple City Model of differentiated staffing may be classified as a curricular teaching and organizational model. It was not developed from a learning theory base; i.e., the model was built on the identification of a specific set of teaching tasks which emp ıasized teaching, curricular and organizational responsibilities.

It is the emphasis on redefining teacher roles according to levels of responsibility in the school organization that provides the contrast with the Top of the World program. The Temple City plan stresses the teacher's role in relation to other teachers and to administrators more than it stresses the teacher's role in relation to students.

As Haven reports it, the Top of the World program has a different focus. Early in their considerations the program designers noted that "somehow the knowledge we possess about growth and development, learning needs, and the way learning takes place was not being applied in our public schools, at least not consistently." Although they decided not to build any new theoretical models, the designers carried out a thorough analysis of traditional programs.

The analysis was student oriented and was carried out with emphasis on how learning takes place. The analysis brought out some "startling revelations" about the basic instructional unit, learning-teaching situations, and how teachers supplement pupil learning tasks.

The program's goal was to build an organizational vehicle that would be consistent with what is known about the way students learn. Top of the World began building its plan by choosing to use team teaching on the theory that a group of interacting teachers was more likely to arrive at effective ideas about education than were individual teachers working alone. Then it began to use the findings of its analysis of educational programs.

This analysis made it clear that the basic instructional unit

is actually a group of 10 students rather than a classroom of 30. The school then determined to base its instruction on nongraded groups of 10 students.

Further analysis resulted in the identification of four teaching-learning situations. Large-group instruction is actually independent of the size of the group but entails an active teacher presenting information and generalizations to passive students. Small-group instruction centers on student-teacher interaction during which the teacher assesses student progress. Two kinds of independent study were identified. In one version, students usually perform tasks directly related to a lesson that has just been given. In the other—independent study for reinforcement—students are usually working on skills that have been learned in the past.

These four teaching-learning situations are managed by three specialists: the large-group, seminar, and lab teachers. The Top of the World program stresses the importance of the seminar and lab teachers. Because the seminar teacher works closely with the students each day, he is in the best position to monitor and evaluate student progress and problems. He works closely with the lab teacher who is the media expert and whose job it is to devise or obtain materials to reinforce student learning.

Each team is led by a subject coordinator who monitors the efforts of the large-group, seminar, and lab teachers to make sure that they cohere in a meaningful way. He also is responsible for student grouping and the goals and content in a subject area.

Student grouping is sophisticated. Learning style (for instance, inductive, deductive; accelerated, remedial, developmental; shy, compulsive, competitive) is the primary criterion for establishing a group. But other aspects of the child are also taken into consideration. For instance, grouping in art, music, and physical education is influenced by the social groups within the school, and grouping in reading and math is influenced by skill level.

The school is designed to reinforce the educational plan. It is made up of two pods, each of which holds up to 240

pupils in a three-grade range. Each pod contains areas specially equipped to support seminars, large groups, or independent study students.

KEEPING THE COST DOWN

As is always the case in education, the cost of a program must eventually be evaluated. It seems particularly necessary in the case of differentiated staffing because many plans include a significant raise in the ceiling of teacher pay schedules. Such a plan will come under close scrutiny by any district's voters.

Although the literature is far from being in agreement on the topic, a sizeable group of writers holds that it is possible to operate a DS school at about the same level of expenditure as a traditionally staffed school.

Swanson reviewed the cost of operating and converting DS schools in or sponsored by Beaverton, Oregon; Camden, New Jersey; Cherry Creek, Colorado; East Windsor, New Jersey; Mesa, Arizona; the Minnesota Project; the Multiunit School Program, University of Wisconsin; Sarasota County, Florida; and Temple City, California. Of these, the Beaverton, Sarasota, Cherry Creek, and East Windsor plans were designed specifically to keep costs within the same bounds as conventional schools.

Swanson also presents a diagram that shows how the Cherry Creek plan managed to significantly reduce the per-pupil expenditure on personnel in a DS program. The saving is achieved by hiring aides and interns while reducing the number of teachers.

Schreiner outlines a similar method that the Lebanon, Indiana, schools have used to increase the number of adults working with children while keeping to a budget similar to or lower than a conventionally staffed school. The Lebanon schools use a formula whereby a teaching vacancy can be filled by another teacher or by a number of supporting staff whose combined salaries do not exceed the average district teacher salary.

In an example, Schreiner explains that it would be possible

to fill two teacher positions on a team with three interns, one paraprofessional, three aides, and one participating observer and still provide extra pay for a team leader. This would produce a large increase in the number of adults working with students.

The Top of the World Elementary School is allotted a certain number of staffing units that can be filled in any number of ways. In this system a teacher is worth one unit, a part-time teacher is worth the appropriate fraction, a full-time intern is .5 unit, a half-time intern is .3, an assistant teacher .4, and an aide .25. Haven reports a savings in personnel costs was achieved by reorganizing teams in a manner similar to that described by Schreiner.

These plans indicate that for the same amount of money used to staff a conventional school, a DS school can provide more adults to work with students and, as a result, individualize instruction while providing a career ladder, paying teachers higher salaries, and freeing teachers from menial, repetitious work.

There are, of course, areas of cost other than personnel. Most concern with DS centers on one-time conversion costs such as inservice training, building remodeling, and material purchasing. The federal government was once the primary source of conversion funds and may still provide some funds, but, as Swanson notes, it is no longer such a likely source.

Districts are, however, meeting and reducing conversion costs in a number of ways. East Windsor, for instance, avoided staff training costs by using administrators to train teachers. Other districts are finding ways to reallocate local funds. Kapfer and Kapfer have proposed a model by which a large elementary school could save enough money from using "instructional technicians" in the place of teachers to free money for use in program development and implementation.

The feasibility of the Kapfer and Kapfer program, and the others like it, is dependent on variables that may be beyond the reach of many districts. In most cases one cannot arbitrarily reduce the number of teachers on a staff. Often, too, "grandfather" clauses that keep salaries high until teachers

with seniority retire or leave a district prevent the realization of anticipated economies. Swanson quotes Robert Lundgren, DS director at Temple City, to the effect that the oversupply of teachers has caused economic difficulties because turnover is lower than anticipated. As a result, the district does not have as many new, low-paid teachers as expected and the district's pay scale has been disrupted.

These are serious points to consider when evaluating the possibility of saving money through staff realignments. More reasonable cost expectations are suggested by the Commission on Public School Personnel Policies in Ohio.

After studying the financial implications of team teaching and differentiated staffing, the commission concluded that when additional expenses arise they are usually incurred at the beginning of the program. The commission attributes initial start-up costs to the needs for "planning, in-service training of teachers and administrators, instructional materials, evaluation, project coordination and conversion of buildings." But these costs, says the commission, can sometimes be met from federal, state, or local funds.

Once the program has been implemented, "team teaching and differentiated staffing can be carried on for virtually the same cost as traditional teaching, but probably not for less," according to the commission. Several factors will influence the actual operating costs; the commission cites the use of paid aides, the availability of federal funds, the provision of new curriculum materials, and the mix of teacher salaries as examples of conditions that will cause cost to vary from district to district.

Finally, the commission rightly observes that "the cost of the total program will depend upon the level of educational quality desired."

OBSTACLES TO IMPLEMENTATION

Differentiated staffing is such an all-encompassing innovation that it is not at all surprising there are significant obstacles to its implementation.

Some of the obstacles are "normal"; that is, it is reasonable to expect that a certain portion of the faculty, students, and parents involved in a district are going to be unhappy with DS. All these objections must be considered. The objections of teachers are, however, of particular importance since teachers must be involved in the planning, implementation, and day-to-day operation of a DS plan. Of the objections that teachers may raise, two that crop up in Bhaerman's 1971 "American Federation of Teachers' Statement on Vertical Staffing" merit special attention.

The American Federation of Teachers' (AFT) statement includes eight tenets that continually emphasize the AFT's opposition to vertical staffing patterns that "create a hierarchy of salary (levels of job responsibilities commensurate with a rate of pay), status and authority, and thus tend to destroy the cooperative and communal effort necessary for a successful teaching effort." The other major objection raised in the statement is that the AFT is "on record as opposing any vertical staffing patterns which reduce the total number of fully certificated staff responsible for the education of pupils, which results in an arbitrary reduction of financing for education, and which is a movement away from the concept of the single salary schedule."

The paper emphasizes that the AFT is not in opposition to all DS. In fact, Bhaerman mentions several horizontally differentiated staffs that the AFT has either proposed or helped to implement. (See also Threinen.) The AFT resolution does not even place it in opposition to a team having a leader who is paid more than the members as long as the leader does more work. This is part of the union stance that supports extra pay

for extra work.

The AFT position is, however, in direct conflict with many DS models, particularly with those that promise to save money by replacing certificated personnel with aides, interns, student teachers, and the like. If, as is likely, a staff will oppose a reduction of certificated personnel, then these plans are in danger and the implementation of DS may cost more than a conventional staffing arrangement will. This will, of course, depend on local conditions.

Other obstacles to the introduction of DS are probably more insidious because they are both obvious and nearly invisible. They are the difficulties that arise whenever an organization is expected to change structurally and functionally. Charters and Pellegrin have enumerated 12 problem areas associated with organizational change as it appears when DS is in its early stage of implementation.

1. The fundamental but generally unacknowledged strain that exists between the ideology of teacher governance and the strategy of directed change.
2. The gross unclarity in conceptualization and definition of what the schools are attempting to implement through change projects.
3. The heavy reliance on structural change (writing job descriptions, changing titles, altering organizational units) in the belief that appropriate behavior changes will automatically follow.
4. The fallacious assumption that a statement of general, abstract program values and objectives will easily be translated into new and appropriate behavior patterns at work.
5. The unrealistic time perspective of those responsible for educational innovation, according to which basic and far-reaching changes in instructional roles and staff relationships are seen as accomplishable within a year or two.
6. The ambiguities and stresses that arise in the disjunction between the school district's established administrative structure and the temporary system for project management.
7. The failure to recognize that teachers have scant training and experience in forming and implementing processes and procedures for collaborative decision making.
8. The conflict in goals, values, and interests, seen especially in the relationships between the central office administrators, the project managers, and the school staffs (produced mainly by

the requirements of their inherently different work contexts).

9. The absence of managerial and monitoring procedures to assure implementation and to alter plans in the face of contingencies that inevitably occur.
10. The failure to recognize the severity of role overload among members of the instructional staff when innovation is attempted.
11. The tyranny of the time schedule in constraining change.
12. The apparent assumption that schools need little additional resources (financial and personnel) to cope with the massive organizational disruptions during the period of transition from one educational program form to a new one.

THE PRINCIPAL'S ROLE

Most discussion of differentiated staffing focuses on the teacher. This is to be expected. As was noted earlier, DS emphasizes the relationship between the teacher and the learner in hopes that by radically changing the teacher's role it will bring about a strong positive change in the learner.

Clearly, however, a change in the role of the teacher also has an effect on the administrative position. Boutwell, in writing about the Temple City model, explains how a DS system alters the role of the principal.

> Differentiated staffing, then, deals primarily with teaching staffs; and, obviously, if a district gives more decision-making prerogatives to the teaching staff and establishes a teaching hierarchy which allows for direct participation in leadership, some adjustments must be made in administrative positions. The administrator becomes a colleague and for the most part becomes a manager and orchestrator of the school plant and program. His major responsibilities, then, lie within the area of facilitating the decisions made by those ultimately responsible for curriculum and instructional programs—the Senior Teachers within the school. He exerts influence, of course; but, in terms of establishment authority, he is equivalent to the Senior Teacher.

In many DS schools, teams of teachers make curriculum, evaluation, hiring, and numerous other decisions that were once thought to be the principal's prerogative. In the face of these incursions, what is the principal's role and is it deteriorating?

There is a good deal of agreement in the literature that the principal's role is changing but is not being minimized or diminished. Numerous examples of the key role the principal plays in successfully implementing DS are available. For instance, Simon reports on the implementation of DS in two schools in Kansas City. The program was far more successful in one school than in the other for a number of reasons, the

principals' attitudes being a major factor. In the successful school, the principal viewed DS as "the tool to maximize all other instructional objectives" and set about providing the proper conditions under which the staff could implement it.

In their progress report on leadership in a DS pilot program, Arends and Essig found that the role of the principal in a unitized elementary school increased in significance and effectiveness with the advent of DS. In the Eugene, Oregon, system, the principal shares responsibilities with Curriculum Associates (CAs) whose duties include implementing curriculum innovations and leading teams.

Arends and Essig note that prior to the introduction of CAs the role of the principal in the elementary school was unmanageable and that hiring vice-principals did not improve it significantly. After the addition of CAs, however, the staff viewed the principal as better able to organize the school and as a more effective leader of the whole school. It was reported that after the principal received this supporting help, he had the relevant facts when he needed to make important decisions and appeared to procrastinate less in his decision-making.

The principal in a DS school does not lose his importance because he shares responsibility for much decision-making. His role simply changes to one that is more managerial. Barbee suggests that the principal's "key administrative functions can include coordinating the work of instructional groups, coping with problems of group conflict, developing schoolwide and systemwide policies, and providing a stimulating professional climate."

The importance of the principal's position in establishing an effective professional climate in a school needs to be stressed. As many authors have noted, the principal is in a position to impede or to expedite progress within a school. Keefe makes a strong case for the importance of the principal's role and his style of leadership.

> Experience forces me to conclude that schools will not be successful in implementing differentiated staffing unless they take seriously McGregor's distinction between adversary and participative modes of leadership. The rapid changes in our

modern world, the greater sophistication of both adults and young people and the long and developing tradition of a democratic style of life have tended to make obsolete the authoritarian style of leadership in many areas of American life. A successful differentiated staff may well depend upon a principal and an administrative staff that can use participatory modes of management in the identification and achievement of goals. When an *administrative staff* can work together as a team of professionals to achieve a sense of mutual confidence from goals and tasks determined by consensus, then *teaching teams* also may be able to see the value of a truly democratic form of team planning. Innovations are successful only when they are understood and implemented on the grass-roots level.

CONCLUSION

In 1972 Edelfelt concluded that, as a movement, differentiated staffing was stalled and going nowhere. In his article he reviewed the changes in education that DS was expected to help implement, the reasons why DS had stalled, and the problems that needed to be overcome before the movement could begin again.

In his conclusion, Edelfelt noted that attempts to differentiate staffs would continue but that "differentiated staffing, and the broader question of curriculum reform, probably won't move much or fast until the public, teachers, or students decide there is something they want or don't want badly enough."

This is probably the crux of the matter when it comes to whether any change is implemented and whether the implementation is successful: if a sufficient number of the administrators, faculty, or students want or don't want the change badly enough they will have their way. For all the talk about fads, bandwagons, and movements, in the end, it is a certain number of people associated with a particular school who make the choice.

Because DS affects all the systems and persons associated with a school, more people than usual will have feelings for and against its implementation. If DS is to work in a school, the plan must be designed by the affected people to meet the educational needs of the school and students involved. For these reasons it is probably best to make a decision about DS in an atmosphere that is relatively free of pressures to innovate for the sake of innovation and to follow a single plan because the plan has been successful elsewhere. DS has the potential to be a process for thorough and positive change in the schools. Now is a good time to investigate it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Many of the items listed in this bibliography are indexed in ERIC's monthly catalogs *Resources in Education (RIE)* and *Current Index to Journals in Education (CIJE)*. Reports in *RIE* are indicated by an "ED" number; journal articles in *CIJE* are indicated by an "EJ" number.

Copies of most ERIC reports, but not journal articles, can be ordered from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. If a report is available from EDRS, its order number and prices are given. When ordering, please specify the "ED" number. Unless otherwise noted, reports are available in both microfiche (MF) and paper copy (HC). Please include check or money order payable to EDRS.

Postage must be added to the cost of all orders. Rates are as follows. Microfiche: $0.18 for up to 60 fiche and $0.08 for each additional 60. Paper copy: $0.18 for first 60 pages and $0.08 for each additional 60.

Address requests to EDRS, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, Virginia 22210.

Allen, Dwight W., and Kline, Lloyd W. "From Habit to Heresy and Home Again. The Roots and Route of Differentiated Staffing." In *Differentiated Staffing*, edited by James M. Cooper, pp. 12-29. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Co., 1972.

American Association of School Administrators. *ERIC Abstracts: A Collection of ERIC Document Resumes on Differentiated Staffing. ERIC Abstracts Series Number Nineteen.* Washington, D.C.: 1971. 34 pages. ED 048 673 MF $0.75 HC $1.85. (Also available from American Association of School Administrators, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036. $2.00, quantity discounts.)

Arends, Richard I., and Essig, Don M. *"Unitized Structure and Differentiated Staffing in the Elementary School." DSP Progress Report No. 1: Structure and Staffing.* Eugene, Oregon: Eugene School District 4, 1972. 28 pages. ED 060 511 MF $0.75 HC $1.85.

Arends, Richard I., and Essig, Don M. *The Role of the Principal and Curriculum Associate in the Unitized, Differentiated Staffing, Elementary School. DSP Progress Report No. 3: Leadership.* Eugene, Oregon: Eugene School District 4, 1972. 22 pages. ED 060 513 MF $0.75 HC $1.50.

Barbee, Don. "Administrative Implications of Differentiated Staffing." *National Elementary Principal*, 51, 4 (January 1972), pp. 61-64. EJ 049 817.

Beard, Jacob G., and others. *An Evaluation of School Personnel Utilization Projects. Volume I, An Overview of Objectives and Outcomes of the Evaluation of School Personnel Utilization Projects.* Tallahassee: Department of Educational Research, Florida State University, [1971]. 33 pages. ED 075 382 MF $0.75 HC $1.85.

Bhaerman, Robert. *A Paradigm for Accountability. QuEST Paper 12.* Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers, 1970. 10 pages. ED 041 870 MF $0.75 HC $1.50. (Also available from AFT, 1012 14th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20005. $0.35.)

Bhaerman, Robert. *American Federation of Teachers' Statement on Vertical Staffing.* Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers, 1971. 7 pages. ED 053 072 MF $0.75 HC $1.50.

Bhaerman, Robert D., compiler. *A Study Outline on Differentiated Staffing. QuEST Report 2.* Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers, 1970. 24 pages. ED 046 865 MF $0.75 HC $1.50. (Also available from American Federation of Teachers, 1012 14th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20005. $0.35.)

Boutwell, Clinton E. "Differentiated Staffing as a Component in a Systematic Change Process." *Educational Technology*, 12, 8 (August 1972), pp. 20-24. EJ 076 918.

Canadian Teachers' Federation. *Differentiated Staffing. Bibliographies in Education No. 36.* Ottawa: 1973. 15 pages. ED 085 353 MF $0.75 HC $1.50.

Central New York Regional Office for Educational Planning. *Differentiated Staffing.* Syracuse, New York: 1971. 627 pages. ED 061 156 MF $1.05 HC $30.60.

Charters, W. W., Jr., and Pellegrin, Roland J. "Barriers to the Innovation Process: Four Case Studies of Differentiated Staffing." *Education Administration Quarterly*, 9, 1 (Winter 1972), pp. 3-14. EJ 070 761.

Charters, W. W., Jr.; Everhart, Robert B.; Jones, John E.; Packard, John S.; Pellegrin, Roland J.; Reynolds, Larry J.; and Wacaster, C. Thompson. *The Process of Planned Change in the School's Instructional Organization. CASEA Monograph No. 25.* Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1973. 128 pages. ED 082 348 MF $0.75 HC $6.60. (Also available from Publications Department, CASEA, 1472 Kincaid Street, Eugene, Oregon 97401. $3.00.)

Commission on Public School Personnel Policies in Ohio. *Organizing for Learning II: Paths to More Flexible Staffing. The Third Report of*

the Commission on Public School Personnel Policies in Ohio. Cleveland: 1972. 67 pages. ED 076 503 MF $0.75 HC $3.15. (Also available from Commission on Public School Personnel Policies in Ohio, 736 National City Bank Building, Cleveland, Ohio 44114. $0.75.)

Cooper, James M. "Differentiated Staffing: Some Questions and Answers." *National Elementary Principal,* 51, 4 (January 1972), pp. 49-54. EJ 050 915.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. *The Education Professions 1971-72. Part II—Differentiated Staffing: A State of the Art Report.* Washington, D.C.: 1973. 47 pages. ED 076 551 MF $0.75 HC $1.85. (Also available from Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Stock No. 1780-1027. $0.65.)

Edelfelt, Roy A. "Differentiated Staffing: Where Are We?" *National Elementary Principal,* 51, 4 (January 1972), pp. 46-48. EJ 050 914.

English, Fenwick W. *A Handbook of the Temple City Differentiated Staffing Project. An Up-to-Date Revision of Project Procedures and Policies.* Temple City, California: Temple City Unified School District, 1970. 48 pages. ED 052 144 MF $0.75 HC $1.85.

English, Fenwick W. "Differentiated Staffing: Refinement, Reform or Revolution?" In *Differentiated Staffing,* edited by James M. Cooper, pp. 30-44. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Co., 1972.

English, Fenwick W., and Frase, Larry E. "Making Form Follow Function in Staffing Elementary Schools." *National Elementary Principal,* 51, 4 (January 1972), pp. 55-60. EJ 050 916.

English, Fenwick W., and Zaharis, James. *How to Build a Model of Staff Differentiation. A Step by Step Guide in the Development of a Situational Specific Site Model of Differentiated Staffing.* Claremont, California: Claremont Graduate School, 1970. 42 pages. ED 051 120 MF $0.75 HC $1.85.

English, Fenwick W., and others. *Evaluating the Effects of Implementing a Differentiated Teaching Staff: Problems and Issues. A Tentative Position Paper for Use in Project Evaluation.* Mesa, Arizona: Mesa Public Schools, 1971. 20 pages. ED 056 993 MF $0.75 HC $1.50.

Fielder, William R.; Nettleman, George; and Conte, Joe. "Differentiated Staffing: An Inservice Program." *National Elementary Principal,* 51, 4 (January 1972), pp. 79-82. EJ 049 821.

Florida State University. *An Evaluation of School Personnel Utilization Projects. Volume III, An Assessment of the Impact of School*

Personnel Utilization Program Training. Tallahassee: Department of Educational Research, 1971. 83 pages. ED 075 384 MF $0.75 HC $4.20.

Frinks, Marshall. *A Readiness for Differentiated Staffing: Questions Relevant to Development and Training Activities.* Tallahassee: Division of Curriculum and Instruction, Florida State Department of Education, 1969. 9 pages. ED 052 143 MF $0.75 HC $1.50.

Haven, Albert. "A View from the Top of the World." *National Elementary Principal,* 51, 4 (January 1972), pp. 71-76. EJ 049 819.

Hyer, Anna, and McClure, Robert M. *New Patterns of Teacher Tasks and Their Implications: The Effect of Innovations on Staffing Patterns and Teacher Roles in the United States.* Paris (France): Directorate for Scientific Affairs, Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, 1973. 70 pages. ED 086 684 MF $0.75 HC $3.15.

Jacobson, Joan L., and others, editors. *A Guide for Assessing the Feasibility of Differentiated Staffing.* Shorewood, Wisconsin: Wisconsin Association of Classroom Teachers, 1971. 28 pages. ED 062 206 MF $0.75 HC not available from EDRS. (Available from Wisconsin Association of Classroom Teachers, P.O. Box 5627, Shorewood, Wisconsin. Stock No. 464RJ. $1.00.)

Kapfer, Philip G., and Kapfer, Miriam B. "Differentiated Staffing for Program Development: An In-Depth Look at an Incentive Model." *Educational Technology,* 12, 6 (June 1972), pp. 9-13. EJ 070 773.

Keefe, James W. "Differentiated Staffing—Its Rewards and Pitfalls." Paper presented at the National Association of Secondary School Principals annual convention, Houston, January 1971. 7 pages. ED 048 635 MF $0.75 HC $1.50.

Maidment, Robert. "Differentiated Staffing. 'Different Strokes for Different Folks.' " *NASSP Bulletin,* 57, 369 (January 1973), pp. 53-56. EJ 069 091.

Moore, Hollis H. "Staff Utilization Reconsidered." *National Elementary Principal,* 51, 4 (January 1972), pp. 65-70. EJ 049 818.

Nussel, Edward J., and others. *The Ohio Model and the Multi-Unit School.* Toledo, Ohio: College of Education, Toledo University, 1971. 71 pages. ED 050 016 MF $0.75 HC $3.15.

Ohio Educational Association. *Interface on Learning: Differentiated Staffing.* Columbus, Ohio: [1971]. 136 pages. ED 060 499 MF $0.75 HC $6.60.

Olson, Margot, and Beard, Jacob G. *An Evaluation of School Personnel Utilization Projects. Volume II, An Analysis of the School Personnel Utilization Programs Goals and Objectives with Suggested Revisions.* Tallahassee: Department of Educational Research, Florida State University, 1971. 43 pages. ED 075 383 MF $0.75 HC $1.85.

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. *Differentiated Staffing: An Annotated Bibliography. Current Bibliography Series No. 3.* Toronto: 1971. 24 pages. ED 071 149 MF $0.75 HC $1.50. (Also available from Publication Sales, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 252 Bloor Street West, Toronto 5, Ontario, Canada. $1.75.)

Piele, Philip K. *New Sets of Jobs for School Personnel. Analysis of Literature and Selected Bibliography. Analysis and Bibliography Series, No. 3.* Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, 1970. 18 pages. ED 043 112 MF $0.75 HC $1.50.

Pillot, Gene M. *A System Model of Differentiated Staffing. A Project Implemented at Pilot Schools under the Direction of the School Board of Sarasota County, Florida.* Sarasota, Florida: Sarasota County Board of Public Instruction, [1970]. 29 pages. ED 052 142 MF $0.75 HC $1.85.

Rand, M. John. "A Case for Differentiated Staffing. Can a Four-Level Organizational Hierarchy of Teachers Change the Pattern of Decision-Making in Education?" In *Differentiated Staffing,* edited by James M. Cooper, pp. 45-53. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Co., 1972.

Rand, M. John, and English, Fenwick W. "Differentiated Staffing: Trying on Seven League Boots." In *Differentiated Staffing,* edited by James M. Cooper, pp. 103-119. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Co., 1972.

Schreiner, Kathy. "How to Get a Baker's Dozen for the Price of Two." *Phi Delta Kappan,* 54, 5 (January 1973), p. 346.

Scobey, Mary-Margaret, and Fiorino, A. John, editors. *Differentiated Staffing.* Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1973. 96 pages. ED 076 586 MF $0.75 HC not available from EDRS. (Available from Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036. Stock No. 17924. $3.50.)

Sharpes, Donald K. "Differentiated Teaching Personnel: A Model for the Secondary School." Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State

University, 1969. 144 pages. ED 035 614 MF $0.75 HC $6.60. (Also available from University Microfilms, P.O. Box 1764, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106. MF $5.00, Xerography $11.00.)

Sharpes, Donald K. "The Federal Investment in Staff Differentiation." In *Differentiated Staffing*, edited by James M. Cooper, pp. 54-64. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Co., 1972.

Simon, Miriam. *A Case Study of the School Personnel Utilization-Differentiated Staffing Project of the School District of Kansas City, Missouri, 1969-1972.* Kansas City, Missouri: Kansas City School District, 1972. 80 pages. ED 072 524 MF $0.75 HC $4.20.

Staropoli, Charles J., and Rumsey, George W. "A Career-Ladder Preparation Model Designed to Implement Differentiated Staffing Patterns." *Journal of Teacher Education*, 23, 4 (Winter 1972), pp. 464-465. EJ 067 901.

Stevens, Jody L. *Differentiated Staffing, Nongraded–Continuous Progress, Open Concept Schools. A Comprehensive Bibliography.* Houston, Texas: Bureau of Educational Research and Services, University of Houston, 1972. 65 pages. ED 066 811 MF $0.75 HC $3.15. (Also available from Bureau of Educational Research and Services, College of Education, University of Houston, Cullen Boulevard, Houston, Texas 77004. $2.00.)

Stocker, Joseph. *Differentiated Staffing in Schools. A Review of Current Policies and Programs.* Washington, D.C.: National School Public Relations Association, 1970. 50 pages. ED 042 727 MF $0.75 HC not available from EDRS. (Available from National School Public Relations Association, 1801 North Moore Street, Arlington, Virginia 22209. Stock No. 411-13403. $4.75.)

Swanson, Carl W. "The Costs of Differentiated Staffing." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 54, 5 (January 1973), pp. 344-348. EJ 069 111.

Templeton, Ian. *Differentiated Staffing. Educational Management Review Series Number 9.* Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, 1972. 12 pages. ED 069 025 MF $0.75 HC $1.50.

Threinen, James. "Differentiated Staffing with a Different Twist." *Changing Education*, (December 1971), p. 17. EJ 049 316.

Wiggins, Sam, editor. *Educational Personnel for Urban Schools; What Differentiated Staffing Can Do.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1972. 43 pages. ED 062 307 MF $0.75 HC $1.85.